

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 13 have been amended. Claim 20 has been added.

Applicant believes the claim amendments and claim 20 do not add new matter. Displaying the relative sizes of components in the gaming environment are described with respect to paragraph 50, page 17. Displaying the components in a 3-D format are described with respect to paragraph 47, page 16.

Specification

Paragraph 54 of the specification has been amended to remove reference to element "60h."

Drawings

Applicant believes the proposed amendment to the specification overcomes the rejection by the Examiner and obviates the need for a drawing correction.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 13-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Howington et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/01152120). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13 has been amended to describe "a graphical user interface for allowing a user of the graphical interface to understand a performance of at least one component of the gaming system within a context of the physical environment in which it resides, said graphical user interface displayable on said display and comprising a main window and a display area in which a graphical representation of at least a portion of a gaming environment may be displayed in a virtual gaming system format wherein the gaming environment comprises at least components of said gaming system, components of a physical environment in which the gaming system resides or combinations thereof and wherein the virtual gaming system format comprises a graphical representation of the components in the gaming environment including one or more displayed elements, said elements displayed in positions relative to one another corresponding to relative positions of said components in the physical environment which said elements represent and said elements displayed in sizes relative to one another corresponding to relative sizes of said components in the physical environment which said elements represent."

Examiner admits in the current office action that the limitations in regards to the physical environment submitted in the amendment July 31, 2003 are not anticipated by Howington. Limitations in regards to the physical environment have been added to claims 13-19. Thus, for at least these reasons, Howington can't be said to anticipate claims 13-17 and 19 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Howington in view of SCADA Technology. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner admits Howington does not disclose that the elements are displayed in positions relative to one another. In addition, Howington does not disclose, as recited in the pending claims, "said elements displayed in sizes relative to one another corresponding to relative sizes of said components in the physical environment which said elements represent." These elements, as described in the claims, are at least components of a gaming system. SCADA does not disclose or described gaming systems in any manner. SCADA is for modeling systems that move fluids/materials, such as oil, waste water and food from one component to the next in a factory setting. Hence, the combination of Howington and SCADA can't be said to anticipate or render obvious claims 1-20.

Further, Applicant believes SCADA may be non-analogous art. MPEP 2100-117 states in order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned." Clearly, SCADA is not in Applicant's field of endeavor. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide some reasoning, in particular supported by a reference, as to why someone in the gaming arts would look at software for viewing the processing of fluids and materials in a factory setting to understand a gaming system such as a plurality of linked gaming machines in a casino.

As recited in claim 13 and described in pending claims 1-20, Howington or SCADA and hence the combination of Howington and SCADA does not disclose, "a graphical user interface for allowing a user of the graphical interface to understand a performance of at least one component of the gaming system within a context of the physical environment in which it resides." The graphical representation of the physical environment and the gaming components provides this context. The need for this context and the lack of this context in current gaming systems is described in the background section of the present invention.

In addition, Howington or SCADA and hence their combination do not describe as described in claims 2, and 13-19, graphically representing the physical environment in which the gaming system resides. Howington and SCADA show 2-D symbolic representation of objects without any graphical representations of the physical environment in which the objects reside. Further, Howington or SCADA and hence their combination do not describe, as recited in claim 20, where "the relative positions and the relative sizes are defined in three dimensions." In Howington, paragraph 4:3, 3-D rectangular icons are employed to represent a gaming machine. These 3-D icons are not related to the relative sizes of the components of the gaming system and/or the physical environment.

Applicant believes the combination of Howington and SCADA is an improper combination for the following three reasons. First, Howington or SCADA do not provide any motivation for the modifications suggested by the Examiner. SCADA is not related to gaming. Howington does not teach or suggest any motivation for "a graphical representation of at least a portion of a gaming environment may be displayed in a virtual gaming system format wherein the gaming environment comprises at least components of said gaming system, components of a physical environment in which the gaming system resides or combinations thereof and wherein the virtual gaming system format comprises a graphical representation of the components in the gaming environment including one or more displayed elements, said elements displayed in positions relative to one another corresponding to relative positions of said components in the physical environment which said elements represent and said elements displayed in sizes relative to one another corresponding to relative sizes of said components in the physical environment which said elements represent." These limitations are not described in Howington and Examiner has not pointed out any teachings in the references suggesting these modifications. Examiner states, "By providing machines that are displayed and positioned corresponding to their actual location, a certain area could be monitored than by coordinates only." **Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to provide a reference that teaches this statement by the Examiner.** Second, Howington teaches away from the present invention. In the 2-D and 3-D displays of Howington, the objects are represented by blocks or rectangles that are indistinguishable from one another. Hence, information regarding the relative sizes of the components is not conveyed in Howington. Third, SCADA, as described above, is non-analogous art. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Howington and SCADA, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 1-10 and 12 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Howington in view of SCADA Technology in further view of Soltys. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claims 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Howington in view Soltys. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Soltys for teachings in regards to security measures and surveillance cameras. These teachings do not overcome the deficiencies in Howington and/or SCADA described above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Howington, SCADA, and Soltys or Howington and Soltys can't be said to render obvious claims 11 and 18 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted, 
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
510-843-6200